I-70 TRAFFIC & REVENUE STUDY ISSUES TASK FORCES

JOINT COST ESTIMATE TASK FORCE MEETING MINUTES

► Meeting Wednesday, ► Time: 2:30pm -3:30pm

Date: *September 25, 2013*

► Meeting Sheraton Denver West, 360 Union, Lakewood, CO

Place: Bergen Room

► Distribution / Attendees ('):

•	John Braaksma	Parsons	•	Julia Barker	Parsons	•	John Crowder	Parsons
•	Jill Donnelly	Parsons	•	Brad Doyle	Parsons	•	Phil Hoffmann	Parsons
,	Ralph Trapani	Parsons	,	Mark	Shannon & Wilson	•	Rick Andrew	Yeh & Assoc.
,	Marianna Torres	Louis Berger Group	,	Lisa McDonald	Louis Berger Group	,		
,	David Krutsinger	CDOT	•	Steve Yip	CDOT	,		
•			•			•		
•			•			•		

	Technical Issue/Challenge	Solution	Client Benefits
1.	I-70 CSS requirements vs.	Brad to develop	At first glance, a designed footprint
	governing agency (AASHTO,	CSS footprint	will be smaller than a CSS footprint,
	CDOT, etc.) design	vs. designed	saving money and time.
	requirements	footprint	
2.	3 rd bore at EJMT	Use only a north	Will be the more expensive option,
		bore for the	which will provide a conservative
		Level 1 study.	comparison with T&R study.
4.	3 rd bore and widened bores at		
	Twin Tunnels		
3.	Roadway drainage cost estimate	Develop a	Will provide a quick way to estimate
		cost/mile	drainage cost for the Level 1 effort.

I-70 TRAFFIC & REVENUE STUDY ISSUES TASK FORCES

Meeting Notes

New Business

Topic #1 – Information Provided

- The CSS guidelines (CSS) to not allow modifications to inside edge of pavement. The Parsons alternative alignments utilize the median. No design exceptions/design deviations to the CSS have been requested to date.
- Brad and Ralph confirmed with Rick Andrews that the CSS were not applied to the options in the PEIS
- CSS requires 30' clear zones (that is, no guardrail or barrier) leading to a very wide typical section, which is not practical for the topographically constrained I-70 Mountain Corridor.
- o Brad is assuming the structures/geotech group will need to cost 3 wall types: Tie-back/soil nail (for uphill cut walls); MSE walls (medial fill wall); MSE or founded walls (for downhill walls).
- The current design accounts for direct connect structures at the Evergreen Parkway exit (existing MP 252), CO 103 in Idaho Springs (existing MP 240); and US 40/Empire (existing MP 232).
- Structures group will need to account for large mammal crossings required by ALIVE.
 Environmental group to provide more information first week of October.
- o Ralph/Joe/Brad to provide answers to questions raised by Phil Hoffmann in 9/26/13 e-mail.

Topic #2 – Action Item Review

o Developed Action Items for register (attached).

Topic #3 - Technical Concepts

o For the Level 1 task, consider the north bore at EJMT only. The south bore will impact Loveland Ski Area and there is an agreement in place with the owners that any future tunneling would not impact the ski area. The north bore is the more expensive option, and will provide a conservative ratio when compared with values from the T&R study.

Topic #4 – Coordination with other Task Forces

- o Brad has an alignment available that Julia and John can use for preliminary structure delineation.
- October 23rd meeting will be held with the Roadway ITF
- The Environmental ITF will have more information about the animal crossing sizes subsequent to their October 1st meeting.

Action Item Register attached.

These notes are an interpretation of discussions held. Please provide any additions or corrections to the originator within seven days of the date signed, otherwise they will be assumed correct as written.

|--|

Next Meeting: October 23rd, Parsons Office (1776 Lincoln Street, Suite 600, Denver, CO 80203)

Time TBD 9:00 AM to 1:30 PM for the Transit Task Force, Kenosha Room, 6th floor

I-70 TRAFFIC & REVENUE STUDY ISSUES TASK FORCES

ACTION ITEM REGISTER

► Combined ITF

Roadway (R), Structures (S), Transit (TR), Tunnels > 09/26/2013 (TU)

Item	Action	Responsibility	Due	Status
1S	Develop existing structure inventory.	J. Barker	10/07/13	
28	Provide Structure Inspection and Inventory Reports/inspection folders for existing structures in corridor.	S. Yip	10/14/13	
3S	New structure delineation.	Barker/Braaksma	10/23/13	
4S	Create structures matrix that will contain basic structure data as well as notes on Performance Measures, design assumptions, etc.	Barker	10/23/13	
5S	Review SWEEP documents for information related to stream crossings.	Barker/Braaksma	10/23/13	
6S	Review ALIVE documents for location of animal crossings. Sizes TBD by Environmental group.	Barker/Braaksma	10/23/13	
1 TR	Define physical elements (and assumptions) of each alternative	Hoffmann	10/23/13	
2TR	Define operating plan assumptions for each alternative	Hoffmann	10/23/13	
3TR	Confirm AGS and BRT ridership projections	Hoffmann/Krutsinger	10/23/13	
4TR	Review/confirm capital cost estimates for AGS	Krutsinger/Hoffmann	10/23/13	
5TR	Develop capital cost estimates for BRT	Hoffmann	10/23/13	
6TR	Review/confirm AGS O&M cost estimates	Krutsinger/Hoffmann	10/23/13	
7TR	Develop O&M cost estimates for BRT	Hoffmann	10/23/13	